

FURTHER COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF
A TYPE SPECIES FOR PLEUROCERA RAFINESQUE, 1818
Z.N.(S) 83

(see vol. 33: 105–113; vol. 34: 196–199; vol. 36: 139–146)

By John B. Burch (*Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA*)

I am writing in support of the proposal to designate the type species of the genus *Pleurocera* Rafinesque as *Pleurocera acuta* Rafinesque, 1831. The use of *Pleurocera* with *P. acuta* as its type species is so deeply entrenched in the literature that to change the concept of the genus now as though *P. verrucosa* were the type species would cause great confusion.

I should point out that all commercially available publications known to me that deal with North American PALUDOMIDAE or PLEUROCERIDAE in any way use *Pleurocera* as though *P. acuta* were its type species. Examples of these follow:

- EDMONDSON, W.T. (Ed.) 1959. *Fresh-water biology* (2nd edit.) (molluscs by W.J. CLENCH: 1117–1160), New York, Wiley and Sons
GRASSÉ, P.-P. (Ed.) 1968. *Traité de zoologie*, vol. 5, fasc. 3 (prosobranch taxonomy by FRANC, A.: 236–316)
WARD, H.B. & WHIPPLE, G.C. (Eds) 1918. *Fresh-water biology* (molluscs by Bryant Walker: 957–1020), New York, Wiley and Sons

These are major publications which have been widely distributed and are readily available to the general public. They are used as standard texts and references by scientists and students in diverse fields. Other important references, widely used for snail identification, which also use *Pleurocera* as though *P. acuta* were its type species, are:

- BAKER, F.C. 1928. *Bull. Wisconsin geol. and nat. Hist. Surv.* no. 70, xx + 507 pp, 28 pls
EDDY, S. & HODSON, A.C. 1950. *Taxonomic keys to the common animals of the north central states* (molluscs: 27–51). Minneapolis, Burgess Publ. Co. (2nd edit., 1955, 3rd edit., 1961)
GOODRICH, C. 1932. *The Mollusca of Michigan*, Univ. Michigan, 120 pp., 7 pls
LA ROCQUE, A. 1953. *Bull. nat. Mus. Canada*, no. 129, ix + 406 pp
——— 1968. *Bull. geol. Surv. Ohio*, no. 62 (3): xv–xxiv, 357–553, pls 9–14
PARRISH, F.K. 1968. *Keys to water quality indicative organisms*. Fed. Water Pollution Control Admin., U.S. Dept. Interior, iv + 202 pp (molluscs by HEARD, W.H.: G1–26)
ROBERTSON, I.C.S. & BLAKESLEE, C.L. 1948. *Bull. Buffalo Soc. nat. Sci.* vol. 19(3), xi + 191 pp., map.

References from the above lists have been used by thousands of invertebrate zoologists, hydrobiologists, paleontologists and students in general.

A search of the non-malacological biological and paleontological literature will show that *Pleurocera* has almost invariably been used as though *P.*

acuta were its type species, and that such references number in their hundreds. I doubt if a single case could be found where *Pleurocera* is used as though *P. verrucosa* were the type species, other than in those very few references already cited in the correspondence regarding this question.

I am in the midst of preparing a manual for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on the freshwater snails of North America. Such a manual is not available to freshwater biologists at present, and so this one, whatever its virtues or faults, will become the main standard for identification. It will be well publicised, readily available, and in fact, will be widely distributed free of charge. Preceding the publication of this manual I prepared an outline of the classification of these gastropods (*J. Conchyliol.* 1978, vol. 105: 3–9; *Malacol. Rev.* 1979, vol. 13: 97–100) already referred to in the papers on this case. In all these publications, *Pleurocera* is used as though *P. acuta* were its type species.

COMMENT ON PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE NAMES OF FOUR
SPECIES OF CARABIDAE (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA) ESTABLISHED
BY LINNAEUS

Z.N.(S) 1237

(see vol. 34: 243–246)

By M. Mroczkowski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, ul.
Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland*)

I am opposed to the late Professor Lindroth's proposals, for the following reasons:

Proposal 1. Both species, *Pterostichus caerulescens* auctorum and *P. cupreus* auctorum, are very well known and common eurosiberian species. Both are unmistakably identified by all coleopterists. Both names are naturalised by long usage in coleopterology. To replace *P. caerulescens* auctorum by *P. versicolor* (Sturm, 1824) and to synonymise *P. caerulescens* with *P. cupreus* would disrupt stability of nomenclature and cause great confusion. I therefore propose another solution and ask the Commission:

- (1) to use its plenary powers
 - (a) to suppress all designations of type specimens hitherto made for the nominal species *Carabus caerulescens* Linnaeus, 1758 and *C. cupreus* Linnaeus, 1758, and, having done so,
 - (b) to designate the first specimen mentioned on : 243 of the late Professor Lindroth's proposal as neotype of *C. cupreus* Linnaeus, 1758, and
 - (c) to designate the type specimen of *Platysma versicolor* Sturm, 1824, as neotype of *Carabus caerulescens* Linnaeus, 1758;